

REMARKS

Claims 1-11

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-11 ultimately depend. Claims 1-8 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baird (2005/0275871) in view of Kishimoto (2002/0035576). Claims 9 and 10 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depend from a rejected base independent claim, claim 1.

Claim 9 depends from claim 8, which depends from claim 7, which depends from claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the limitations of claims 7-9, and has cancelled claims 7-9. Claim 10 has been amended to depend from claim 1 instead of from now-cancelled claim 9. Applicant thus submits that claim 1 is patentable, such that claims 2-6 and 10-11 are patentable at least because they depend from a patentable base independent claim, claim 1.

Claims 12-14

Claim 12 is an independent claim, from which claims 13-14 ultimately depend. Claims 12-14 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baird in view of Kishimoto. Applicant has amended claim 12 in substantially the same way that claim 1 has been amended, as discussed above. Claim 13 has been cancelled. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 12 is patentable, such that claim 14 is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable base independent claim.

Claims 15-19

Claim 15 is an independent claim, from which claims 16-19 ultimately depend. Claims 15-16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baird in view of

Kishimoto. Claims 17-19 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depend from a rejected base independent claim.

Claim 17 depends from claim 16, which depends from claim 15. Applicant has amended claim 15 to recite the limitations of claims 16-17, and has cancelled claims 16-17. Claims 18-19 have been amended to depend from claim 15 instead of from now-cancelled claim 17. Applicant thus submits that claim 15 is patentable, such that claims 18-19 are patentable at least because they depend from a patentable base independent claim, claim 15.

Claims 20-23

Claim 20 is an independent claim, from which claims 21-23 ultimately depend. Claims 20-23 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baird in view of Kishimoto. Applicant has amended claim 20 in substantially the same way that claim 1 has been amended, as discussed above. Claim 21 has been cancelled, and claims 22-23 have been amended to depend from claim 20 instead of from now-cancelled claim 21. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 20 is patentable, such that claims 22-23 are patentable at least because they depend from a patentable base independent claim.

Claim 24

Claim 24 is an independent claim, and has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baird in view of Kishimoto. Applicant has amended claim 24 in substantially the same way that claim 1 has been amended, as discussed above. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 24 is patentable.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicants' Attorney, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

July 10, 2008
Date

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
1474 N Cooper Rd #105-248
Gilbert, AZ 85233

tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 425-563-2098